(iv) specifying ground for denial, suspension and revocation of licenses, issue of identification cards,

(v) specifying the type of training required for private security guards, and

(vi) specifying the duties of employers and powers of licencing authorities.

The important changes suggested by the Committee are in articles 5,6,8 and 13 of the Bill. These changes require; (a) the training of the security guards to be increased from one month to 3 months (b) the security guards should also preferably be appointed from amongst the ex-servicemen, former Civil and Armed police personnel, Home Guards, (c) the supervisors should also go through the verification of character and antecedents, (d) debarring a company, firm or an association of persons not registered in India from setting up any security agencies in India (e) that every private security agency shall maintain a register containing the names, addresses and salaries of supervisors also under its control.

The Ministry of Home Affairs will also consider issuing an amendment to the Arms Act, allowing the issue of licenses to the Private Security Agencies also as per requirement assessed by the licencing authority.

The Bill will not cover private detective agencies at present and will be restricted to private security agencies. Instead, it is proposed to issue administrative guidelines to State Governments and Union Territories regarding Private Detective Agencies. Depending on the experience in implementing these guidelines, a decision will be taken on whether or not extend the ligislation to cover private detective agencies as well.

With the above words, I commend the Bill on Regulation of Private Security Guards and Agencies for consideration and passing by this August House.

The question was proposed.

THE COAST-GUARD (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996.—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Before I call the next speaker to speak on the Private Security Guards and Agencies (Regulation) Bill, 1994, I would like to know if Mr. Somu would like to move the motion for setting up of the Select Committee to consider the Coast-Guard (Amendment) Bill, 1996.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI N.V.N. SOMU): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir I beg to move:

That the Bill further to amend the Coast Guard Act, 1978, be referred to a Select Committee.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): What about the composition of the Committee?

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU: Sir, I will announce the names tomorrow after consultation with the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Now the question is that the Bill further to amend the Cost Guard Act, 1978 be referred to a Select Committee.

The motion was adopted.

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल (राजस्थान): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी पांच बजने में दस मिनट हैं और एक्सपोर्ट-इम्पोर्ट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया (अमेंडमेंड) बिल, 1997 पेंडिंग है। I would like to know whether we will finish all the Bills today itself or we would defer some of them to tomorrow

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I think let us first discuss the Bill initiated

by the hon. Home Minister. On the question whether we would finish all the Bills today or not, I think I will to take the sense of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Let us take them up tomorrow, Sir.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): Sir, the hon. Minister has already initiated the Bill. I think we should start it first even if it is going to be inconclusive.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): It is already 4.50 p.m. I just want to take the sense of the House.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI: Tomorrow, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Is it the sense of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Okay. Now, Shri John F. Fernandes.

THE PRIVATE SECURITY GUARDS AND AGENCIES (REGULATION) BILL, 1994—Contd.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, for permitting me to speak on this Bill.

Sir, I rise to support the Private Security Guards and Agencies (Regulation) Bill, 1994. This Bill is long overdue in our country because we have seen cases of impersonation by private agencies and sometimes some terrorist outfits. We have come across cases of misuse by these agencies and terrorists for plundering and looting the banks.

I don't know why copies of the amended Bill brought by the hon. Home Minister are not being circulated to us because the Bill which has been circulated to the Members is the old Bill introduced by Chavanji. The hon. Home Minister has just now mentioned that in view of the recommendations made by the Standing Committee on Home Affairs, he has proposed amendments to clauses 5, 6, 8 and 13 of the Bill. Had the amended Bill been circulated, we would have well prepared and been in a position to offer very good suggestions. Anyway I am supporting this Bill. In clause 2, it has been mentioned that security means security of a person or property or both. Now these private security people would be dressed in the uniform of our Defence people or at least very near to their uniform. The jurisdiction of a private security person has also not been made clear. We don't know whether a person will be protected in Connaught Place, in his home or in his factory. We have seen that politicians and VIPs use it as a status symbol. The more the black cats or black dogs you have around you, the more your status would be. My apprehension is that private security may be misused in public places. If I want to show my status symbol, I can have about ten guards around me and I can go out to a shopping complex or a shopping plaza. This has not been defined by the hon. Home Minister. And I don't think this can be controlled by the rules of State Government. Unless this is clarified in the principal Act or the Bill, there will be confusion.

Then there will be a controlling authority and the Home Minister has mentioned as to what will be the stature of the person. His stature will be not below the rank of an Inspector General of Police or the Commissioner of Police. In our States there is no officer who is above this rank. It only means that an IGP or a Commissioner of Police will be the controlling authority. It would have been appropriate not to restrict it in this way. There could be a bureaucrat also. Of course, I don't know whether it is going to be a constitutional authority and whether that police officer will be in a position to give a speaking-order, which has been mentioned in the Bill. It has been mentioned